

STARSHAPED COMPACT HYPERSURFACES WITH PRESCRIBED m -TH MEAN CURVATURE IN HYPERBOLIC SPACE

QINIAN JIN AND YANYAN LI

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathbb{S}^n$ be the unit sphere in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, and let e be the standard metric on $\mathbb{S}^n$ induced from $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Suppose that (u, ρ) are the spherical coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, where $u \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $\rho \in [0, \infty)$. By choosing the smooth function $\varphi(\rho) := \sinh^2 \rho$ on $[0, \infty)$ we can define a Riemannian metric h on the set $\{(u, \rho) : u \in \mathbb{S}^n, 0 \leq \rho < \infty\}$ as follows

$$h = d\rho^2 + \varphi(\rho)e.$$

This gives the space form $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$ which is the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ with sectional curvature -1 . For a smooth hypersurface $\mathcal{M}$ in $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$, we denote by $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ its principal curvatures with respect to the metric $g := h|_{\mathcal{M}}$. Then, for each $1 \leq k \leq n$, the k -th mean curvature of $\mathcal{M}$ is defined as

$$H_k = \binom{n}{k}^{-1} \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_k} \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_k}.$$

Let $\psi(u, \rho)$, $u \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, be a given positive smooth function satisfying suitable conditions. We are interested in the existence of a smooth hypersurface $\mathcal{M}$ embedded in $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$ as a graph over $\mathbb{S}^n$ so that its k -th mean curvature is given by ψ . We refer the readers to [7] and [5] for the introductory material and the history of this problem.

It is clear that $\mathcal{M} := \{(u, z(u)) : u \in \mathbb{S}^n\}$ is an embedded hypersurface in $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$ for any smooth positive function z on $\mathbb{S}^n$. We call z k -admissible if the principal curvatures $(\lambda_1(z(u)), \dots, \lambda_n(z(u)))$ of $\mathcal{M}$ belong to Γ_k , where Γ_k is the connected component of $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : H_k(\lambda) > 0\}$ containing the positive cone $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_1 > 0, \dots, \lambda_n > 0\}$.

The main result of this paper is the following

Theorem 1. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n$, and let ψ be a smooth positive function in the annulus $\overline{\Omega} : u \in \mathbb{S}^n, \rho \in [R_1, R_2], 0 < R_1 < R_2 < \infty$, satisfying the conditions*

$$\psi(u, R_1) \geq \coth^k(R_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(u, R_2) \leq \coth^k(R_2) \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{S}^n$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (\psi(u, \rho) \sinh^k \rho) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{S}^n \text{ and } \rho \in [R_1, R_2].$$

Then there exists a positive smooth k -admissible function z on $\mathbb{S}^n$ such that the closed hypersurface $\mathcal{M} := \{(u, z(u)) : u \in \mathbb{S}^n\}$ is in $\Omega \subset \mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$, and its k -th mean

curvature is given by ψ :

$$H_k(\lambda_1(z(u)), \dots, \lambda_n(z(u))) = \psi(u, z(u)) \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

In the Euclidean space $(\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(0))$, such results were obtained in the case $k = 0$ by Bakelman and Kantor [3], [4] and by Treibergs and Wei [19], in the case $k = n$ by Oliker [15], and for general k by Caffarelli, Nirenberg and Spruck [7]. In the elliptic space $(\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(+1))$, such result is the combination of the work of Barbosa, Lira and Oliker [5] and that of Li and Oliker [14]. The $k = n$ case in Theorem 1 was established by Oliker [16]. Our proof of Theorem 1 uses the C^0 and C^1 a priori estimates obtained in [5] and the arguments in [14] which is based on the degree theory for fully nonlinear elliptic operator of second order developed in [12]. The main work for us to prove Theorem 1 is to give the C^2 a priori estimates. In establishing the C^2 estimates, we make use Lemma 2, a quantitative version of a theorem of Davis [9] which, to our knowledge, was given in [1]. The theorem in [9] says that a rotationally invariant function on symmetric matrices is concave if and only if it is concave on the diagonal matrices, while Lemma 2 allows the use of this term in making C^2 a priori estimates. The use of such a concave term in C^2 estimates for solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation has been extensive, see e.g. Calabi [8] and Pogorelov [17]. The use of Lemma 2 in C^2 estimates for solutions of more general equations can be found in [1], [2], [11], [18], [20] and [21].

Acknowledgement. The work of the second author is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0401118.

2. SOME FUNDAMENTAL FORMULAE

Let us define a function f on Γ_k by

$$f(\lambda) = \left[\binom{n}{k}^{-1} \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_k} \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_k} \right]^{1/k},$$

where $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma_k$. It is well known that f is smooth, positive, concave, and strictly increasing with respect to each variable, see e.g. [6]. Now our problem is equivalent to finding a smooth positive k -admissible function z on $\mathbb{S}^n$ so that

$$F(\mathbf{B}) = \bar{\psi} \tag{1}$$

on $\mathcal{M} := \{(u, z(u)) : u \in \mathbb{S}^n\}$, where $\bar{\psi} := \psi^{1/k}$, $\mathbf{B}$ is the second fundamental form of $\mathcal{M}$, and $F(\mathbf{B}) := f(\lambda(\mathbf{B}))$ with $\lambda(\mathbf{B})$ being the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}$ with respect to the metric g on $\mathcal{M}$.

Suppose now $\mathcal{M}$ is the graph of a smooth positive k -admissible function z on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Let us recall the formulae given in [5] for the components of $g = (g_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{B} = (b_{ij})$ on $\mathcal{M}$ under a local coordinate. Let $\theta^1, \dots, \theta^n$ be a smooth local coordinate of $\mathbb{S}^n$, which

of course gives a local coordinate of $\mathcal{M}$. If we denote by $\{e_{ij}\}$ the components of e under this local coordinate, and set $z_i = \frac{\partial z}{\partial \theta^i}$ and $z_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial \theta^i \partial \theta^j}$, then

$$g_{ij} = \varphi e_{ij} + z_i z_j \quad (2)$$

and

$$g^{ij} = \frac{1}{\varphi} \left[e^{ij} - \frac{z^i z^j}{\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2} \right], \quad z^i = e^{ij} z_j, \quad (3)$$

where $(g^{ij}) = (g_{ij})^{-1}$, $(e^{ij}) = (e_{ij})^{-1}$, and ∇' denotes the Levi-Civita connection on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Moreover, for the second fundamental form we have

$$b_{ij} = \frac{\varphi}{\sqrt{\varphi^2 + \varphi |\nabla' z|^2}} \left\{ -\nabla'_{ij} z + \frac{\partial \ln \varphi}{\partial \rho} z_i z_j + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \rho} e_{ij} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

We also need the following well-known fundamental equations for a hypersurface $\mathcal{M}$ in $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$:

$$\text{Codazzi equation:} \quad \nabla_i b_{jk} = \nabla_j b_{ki} = \nabla_k b_{ij} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Gauss equation:} \quad R_{ijkl} = (b_{ik} b_{jl} - b_{il} b_{jk}) - (g_{ik} g_{jl} - g_{il} g_{jk}) \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Ricci equation:} \quad \nabla_l \nabla_k b_{ij} - \nabla_k \nabla_l b_{ij} = b_{ip} g^{pq} R_{qjkl} + b_{jp} g^{pq} R_{qikl} \quad (7)$$

where R_{ijkl} denotes the Riemannian curvature tensor of $\mathcal{M}$, and ∇_i and $\nabla_i \nabla_j$ the covariant differentiations in the metric g with respect to some local coordinates on $\mathcal{M}$.

As the preparation for deriving the C^2 -estimates, let us introduce the following two functions on $\mathcal{M}$

$$\tau = \frac{\varphi(z)}{\sqrt{\varphi(z) + |\nabla' z|^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = -\cosh(z). \quad (8)$$

We have

Lemma 1. *For τ and η the following equations hold*

$$\nabla_i \tau = -b_{ip} g^{pq} \nabla_q \eta, \quad (9)$$

$$\nabla_{ij} \tau = -\nabla_p b_{ij} g^{pq} \nabla_q \eta - \tau b_{ip} g^{pq} b_{qj} - \eta b_{ij}, \quad (10)$$

$$\nabla_{ij} \eta = \tau b_{ij} + \eta g_{ij}. \quad (11)$$

Proof. These formulae have been derived in [5] by using another model of $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$. In fact, we can show them directly. Since (10) is an immediate consequence of (9), (11) and the Codazzi equation (5), it suffices to verify (9) and (11). Let $c(\rho) = \cosh(\rho)$ and $s(\rho) = \sinh(\rho)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i \tau &= \frac{2sc}{\sqrt{\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2}} z_i - \frac{\varphi}{(\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2)^{3/2}} (sc z_i + e^{pq} \nabla'_{ip} z \nabla'_q z) \\ &= \frac{1}{(\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2)^{3/2}} \{ sc \varphi z_i + 2sc z_i |\nabla' z|^2 - \varphi \nabla'_{ip} z z^p \} \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\nabla_q \eta = -sz_q$, we have from (3) and (4) that

$$b_{ip} g^{pq} \nabla_q \eta = -\frac{s}{\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2} b_{ip} z^p = -\nabla_i \tau.$$

Let us now verify (11) for any fixed $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{S}^n$. Noting that the both sides of (11) are tensorial, we may assume that the local coordinates are chosen such that $\frac{\partial g_{jk}}{\partial \theta^i} = 0$ at $\bar{u}$. Then from (2) we have

$$\frac{\partial e_{lj}}{\partial \theta^i} = -\frac{2sc}{\varphi^2} (g_{lj} - z_l z_j) z_i - \frac{1}{\varphi} (z_{il} z_j + z_l z_{ij}).$$

Thus the corresponding Christoffel symbols of $\mathbb{S}^n$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ij}^k &= \frac{1}{2} e^{kl} \left\{ \frac{\partial e_{lj}}{\partial \theta^i} + \frac{\partial e_{li}}{\partial \theta^j} - \frac{\partial e_{ij}}{\partial \theta^l} \right\} \\ &= -\frac{sc}{\varphi^2} \{ e^{kl} g_{lj} z_i + e^{kl} g_{li} z_j - g_{ij} z^k - z_i z_j z^k \} - \frac{1}{\varphi} z_{ij} z^k. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

This, together with (2), gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla'_{ij} z &= z_{ij} - \Gamma_{ij}^k z_k \\ &= \frac{\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2}{\varphi} z_{ij} + \frac{sc}{\varphi^2} \{ g_{lj} z_i z^l + g_{li} z_j z^l - g_{ij} |\nabla' z|^2 - z_i z_j |\nabla' z|^2 \} \\ &= \frac{\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2}{\varphi} z_{ij} + \frac{sc}{\varphi} (2z_i z_j - |\nabla' z|^2 e_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\nabla_{ij} z = z_{ij}$ at $\bar{u}$, we thus have

$$\nabla_{ij} z = \frac{1}{\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2} (\varphi \nabla'_{ij} z - 2sc z_i z_j + sc |\nabla' z|^2 e_{ij}). \quad (13)$$

Therefore

$$\nabla_{ij} \eta = -cz_i z_j - s \nabla_{ij} z = -cz_i z_j - \frac{s}{\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2} (\varphi \nabla'_{ij} z - 2sc z_i z_j + sc |\nabla' z|^2 e_{ij}).$$

But from (2) and (4) we can see that the right hand side of the above equation is exactly $\tau b_{ij} + \eta g_{ij}$. ■

3. C^2 -ESTIMATES

Now we are in a position to derive the C^2 estimates for any smooth positive k -admissible solutions of (1) in $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$. Let us set

$$f_i = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}, \quad F^{ij} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial b_{ij}} \quad \text{and} \quad F^{ij,kl} = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial b_{ij} \partial b_{kl}}.$$

We will achieve our aim by choosing suitable test function and making full use of the terms involving $F^{ij,kl}$. In particular, we need the following

Lemma 2. ([1]) *For any symmetric matrix (η_{ij}) there holds*

$$F^{ij,kl} \eta_{ij} \eta_{kl} = \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda_i \partial \lambda_j} \eta_{ii} \eta_{jj} + \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{f_i - f_j}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j} \eta_{ij}^2,$$

where the second term on the right-hand side must be interpreted as a limit whenever $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$.

This result was, to our knowledge, first stated in [1]; for proofs one may consult [11, 2].

Theorem 2. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n$ and let ψ be a positive C^2 function in the annulus $\overline{\Omega} : u \in \mathbb{S}^n, \rho \in [R_1, R_2], 0 < R_1 < R_2 < a$. Let $z \in C^4(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a positive k -admissible solution of (1) in $\mathcal{R}^{n+1}(-1)$ satisfying*

$$R_1 \leq z \leq R_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla' z| \leq C_0 = \text{constant} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n.$$

Then

$$\|z\|_{C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)} \leq C,$$

where the constant C depends only on k, n, R_1, R_2, C_0 and $\|\psi\|_{C^2(\overline{\Omega})}$.

Proof. We will estimate the maximal principal curvature of $\mathcal{M}$. Since z is k -admissible, this estimate, together with the C^0 and C^1 bounds of z and the equation (4), implies an estimate for $\|z\|_{C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)}$. Consider the function

$$\widetilde{W}(u, \xi) = \mathbf{B}(\xi, \xi) \exp [\Phi(\tau) - \beta\eta],$$

where $u \in \mathbb{S}^n$, ξ is a unit tangent vector of $\mathcal{M}$ at $(u, z(u))$, τ and η are defined as in (8), and the function Φ and the constant $\beta > 0$ will be determined later. Suppose the maximum of $\widetilde{W}$ is attained at some point $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{S}^n$ in the unit tangential direction $\bar{\xi}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ at $(\bar{u}, z(\bar{u}))$. We may choose the local coordinates $\theta^1, \dots, \theta^n$ around $\bar{u}$ such that

$$g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial \theta^k} = 0 \quad \text{at } \bar{u}.$$

Moreover, since $\bar{\xi}$ is the maximal principal direction of $\mathcal{M}$ at $(\bar{u}, z(\bar{u}))$, such coordinates can be chosen so that $\{b_{ij}\}$ is diagonal at $\bar{u}$ and $b_{11}(\bar{u}) = \mathbf{B}(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\xi})$.

Consider the local function $Z = b_{11}/g_{11}$. By direct calculation we have at $\bar{u}$ that

$$\nabla_i Z = \frac{\partial b_{11}}{\partial \theta^i} = \nabla_i b_{11}$$

and

$$\nabla_i \nabla_j Z = \frac{\partial^2 b_{11}}{\partial \theta^i \partial \theta^j} - b_{11} \frac{\partial^2 g_{11}}{\partial \theta^i \partial \theta^j} = \frac{\partial^2 b_{11}}{\partial \theta^i \partial \theta^j} - 2 \frac{\partial \Gamma_{j1}^1}{\partial \theta^i} b_{11} = \nabla_i \nabla_j b_{11}.$$

It is clear that the function

$$W(u) = Z(u) \exp [\Phi(\tau) - \beta\eta].$$

has a local maximum at $\bar{u}$. Thus at $\bar{u}$

$$0 = \nabla_i (\log W) = \frac{\nabla_i Z}{Z} + \Phi' \nabla_i \tau - \beta \nabla_i \eta = \frac{\nabla_i b_{11}}{b_{11}} + \Phi' \nabla_i \tau - \beta \nabla_i \eta \quad (14)$$

and the matrix

$$\begin{aligned}\{\nabla_{ij}(\log W)\} &= \left\{ \frac{\nabla_i \nabla_j Z}{Z} - \frac{\nabla_i Z \nabla_j Z}{Z^2} + \Phi' \nabla_{ij} \tau + \Phi'' \nabla_i \tau \nabla_j \tau - \beta \nabla_{ij} \eta \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \frac{\nabla_i \nabla_j b_{11}}{b_{11}} - \frac{\nabla_i b_{11} \nabla_j b_{11}}{b_{11}^2} + \Phi' \nabla_{ij} \tau + \Phi'' \nabla_i \tau \nabla_j \tau - \beta \nabla_{ij} \eta \right\}\end{aligned}$$

is negative semi-definite. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq F^{ij} \nabla_{ij}(\log W) &= \frac{1}{b_{11}} F^{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j b_{11} - \frac{1}{b_{11}^2} F^{ij} \nabla_i b_{11} \nabla_j b_{11} + \Phi' F^{ij} \nabla_{ij} \tau \\ &\quad + \Phi'' F^{ij} \nabla_i \tau \nabla_j \tau - \beta F^{ij} \nabla_{ij} \eta.\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

Since $\{b_{ij}\}$ is diagonal at $\bar{u}$, $\{F^{ij}\}$ is also diagonal there and $F^{ii} = f_i$. For simplicity, we let $\lambda_i = b_{ii}(\bar{u})$ and assume $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$, moreover we may assume $\lambda_1 \geq 1$. Then, see lemma 2 in [10] or lemma A.2 in [13], we have $f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \dots \leq f_n$. It follows from (15) that

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq & \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_i f_i \nabla_i \nabla_i b_{11} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_i f_i |\nabla_i b_{11}|^2 + \Phi' \sum_i f_i \nabla_{ii} \tau \\ & + \Phi'' \sum_i f_i |\nabla_i \tau|^2 - \beta \sum_i f_i \nabla_{ii} \eta.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

Now we take the covariant differentiation on (1) to get

$$F^{ij} \nabla_1 \nabla_1 b_{ij} + F^{ij,kl} \nabla_1 b_{ij} \nabla_1 b_{kl} = \nabla_{11} \bar{\psi}.\tag{17}$$

From (5), (6) and (7) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_1 \nabla_1 b_{ii} &= \nabla_1 \nabla_i b_{1i} = \nabla_i \nabla_1 b_{1i} + \sum_k b_{1k} R_{kii1} + \sum_k b_{ik} R_{k1i1} \\ &= \nabla_i \nabla_i b_{11} + b_{11} b_{ii}^2 - b_{11}^2 b_{ii} - (b_{11} \delta_{1i} - b_{11} \delta_{ii} + b_{ii} - b_{ii} \delta_{1i}).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$F^{ij} \nabla_1 \nabla_1 b_{ij} = \sum_i f_i \nabla_i \nabla_i b_{11} + \lambda_1 \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 - \lambda_1^2 \sum_i f_i \lambda_i + \lambda_1 \mathcal{T} - \sum_i f_i \lambda_i,$$

where $\mathcal{T} := \sum_i f_i$. Since the degree one homogeneity of f implies $\sum_i f_i \lambda_i = \bar{\psi}$, the above equation together with (17) gives

$$\sum_i f_i \nabla_i \nabla_i b_{11} = -F^{ij,kl} \nabla_1 b_{ij} \nabla_1 b_{kl} + \nabla_{11} \bar{\psi} + \lambda_1^2 \bar{\psi} + \bar{\psi} - \lambda_1 \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 - \lambda_1 \mathcal{T}.$$

Plugging this into (16), noting that $\bar{\psi} \geq c_0 > 0$ and $\lambda_1 \geq 1$, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq & c_0 \lambda_1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ij,kl} \nabla_1 b_{ij} \nabla_1 b_{kl} + \frac{\nabla_{11} \bar{\psi}}{\lambda_1} - \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 - \mathcal{T} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_i f_i |\nabla_i b_{11}|^2 \\ & + \Phi' \sum_i f_i \nabla_{ii} \tau + \Phi'' \sum_i f_i |\nabla_i \tau|^2 - \beta \sum_i f_i \nabla_{ii} \eta.\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

From (10) and (11) we have

$$\beta \sum_i f_i \nabla_{ii} \eta = \beta \tau \sum_i f_i \lambda_i + \beta \eta \mathcal{I} = \beta \tau \bar{\psi} + \beta \eta \mathcal{I}. \quad (19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi' \sum_i f_i \nabla_{ii} \tau &= \Phi' \left\{ - \sum_p \nabla_p \eta \left(\sum_i f_i \nabla_p b_{ii} \right) - \tau \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 - \eta \sum_i f_i \lambda_i \right\} \\ &= \Phi' \left\{ - \sum_p \nabla_p \eta \nabla_p \bar{\psi} - \tau \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 - \eta \bar{\psi} \right\} \\ &\geq -C |\Phi'| - \Phi' \tau \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Here we used the facts $|\nabla_p \eta| \leq C$ and $|\nabla_p \bar{\psi}| \leq C$ at $\bar{u}$ which can be demonstrated as follows. Since $g_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$ at $\bar{u}$, it follows from (2) that $(z_p)^2 \leq 1$ at $\bar{u}$. Note that $\nabla_p \eta = -\sinh(z) z_p$. Therefore $|\nabla_i \eta| \leq C$ at $\bar{u}$. For $|\nabla_p \bar{\psi}|$, we note that $\nabla_p \bar{\psi} = \bar{\psi}_p + \bar{\psi}_z z_p$. Thus, by using (3), we have at $\bar{u}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_p \bar{\psi}|^2 &\leq C (1 + |\bar{\psi}_p|^2) \leq C (1 + g^{ij} \bar{\psi}_i \bar{\psi}_j) \leq C (1 + \varphi^{-1} e^{ij} \bar{\psi}_i \bar{\psi}_j) \\ &= C (1 + \varphi^{-1} |\nabla' \bar{\psi}|^2) \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

One can show that

$$\frac{\nabla_{11} \bar{\psi}}{\lambda_1} \geq -C \quad \text{at } \bar{u}. \quad (21)$$

To see this, note that $\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial \theta^k} = 0$ at $\bar{u}$, we have

$$\nabla_{11} \bar{\psi} = \bar{\psi}_{11} + 2\bar{\psi}_{z1} z_1 + \bar{\psi}_{zz} (z_1)^2 + \bar{\psi}_z z_{11}.$$

Similar to the above argument we can show $|\bar{\psi}_{z1}| \leq C$ at $\bar{u}$. Therefore at $\bar{u}$

$$|\nabla_{11} \bar{\psi}| \leq C (1 + |\bar{\psi}_{11}| + |z_{11}|).$$

Let us estimate $|\bar{\psi}_{11}|$. It follows from (3) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla'_{11} \bar{\psi}|^2 &\leq g^{ik} g^{jl} \nabla'_{ij} \bar{\psi} \nabla'_{kl} \bar{\psi} \\ &\leq \varphi^{-2} e^{ik} e^{jl} \nabla'_{ij} \bar{\psi} \nabla'_{kl} \bar{\psi} + \varphi^{-2} (\varphi + |\nabla' z|^2)^{-2} (z^i z^j \nabla'_{ij} \bar{\psi})^2 \\ &\leq \varphi^{-2} |\nabla'^2 \bar{\psi}|^2 + \varphi^{-2} (\varphi^2 + |\nabla' z|^2)^{-2} |\nabla'^2 \bar{\psi}|^2 |\nabla' z \otimes \nabla' z|^2 \\ &\leq \varphi^{-2} |\nabla'^2 \bar{\psi}|^2 + \varphi^{-2} (\varphi^2 + |\nabla' z|^2)^{-2} |\nabla'^2 \bar{\psi}|^2 |\nabla' z|^4 \\ &\leq C \end{aligned}$$

By using (2) we obtain at $\bar{u}$ that

$$\sum_i |z^i|^2 = g_{ij} z^i z^j = \varphi |\nabla' z|^2 + |\nabla' z|^4 \leq C.$$

This together with (3) then implies $|e^{ij}| \leq C$. Thus it follows from (12) that $|\Gamma'_{11}{}^k| \leq C(1 + |z_{11}|)$ at $\bar{u}$. Since $\bar{\psi}_{11} = \nabla'_{11}\bar{\psi} + \Gamma'_{11}{}^k\bar{\psi}_k$, we therefore have $|\bar{\psi}_{11}| \leq C(1 + |z_{11}|)$. Since $z_{11} = \nabla_{11}z$ at $\bar{u}$, from (13) and (4) we finally obtain

$$|\nabla_{11}\bar{\psi}| \leq C(1 + |z_{11}|) \leq C(1 + \lambda_1)$$

which gives (21).

Combining (18), (19), (20) and (21), we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & c_0\lambda_1 - C(1 + |\Phi'|) - (1 + \beta\eta)\mathcal{T} - \beta\tau\bar{\psi} - (\Phi'\tau + 1) \sum_i f_i\lambda_i^2 + \Phi'' \sum_i f_i|\nabla_i\tau|^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_i f_i|\nabla_ib_{11}|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ij,kl} \nabla_1 b_{ij} \nabla_1 b_{kl}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Now we will use Lemma 2, similar to the way used in [18].

Case 1. $\lambda_n < -\theta\lambda_1$ for some positive constant θ (to be chosen later).

In this case, using the concavity of F we may discard the last term on the right hand side of (22) since it is nonnegative. Also from (14) we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_i f_i|\nabla_ib_{11}|^2 &= \sum_i f_i|\Phi'\nabla_i\tau - \beta\nabla_i\eta|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon^{-1})\beta^2 \sum_i f_i|\nabla_i\eta|^2 + (1 + \varepsilon)(\Phi')^2 \sum_i f_i|\nabla_i\tau|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (22) it yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & c_0\lambda_1 - C(1 + |\Phi'|) - [(1 + \beta\eta) + C(1 + \varepsilon^{-1})\beta^2] \mathcal{T} - \beta\tau\bar{\psi} - (\Phi'\tau + 1) \sum_i f_i\lambda_i^2 \\ & + [\Phi'' - (1 + \varepsilon)(\Phi')^2] \sum_i f_i|\nabla_i\tau|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Using (9) we have

$$\sum_i f_i|\nabla_i\tau|^2 = \sum_i f_i\lambda_i^2|\nabla_i\eta|^2 \leq c_1 \sum_i f_i\lambda_i^2$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$. If we can choose Φ such that $\Phi'' - (1 + \varepsilon)(\Phi')^2 \leq 0$, then from (23) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & c_0\lambda_1 - C(1 + |\Phi'|) - [(1 + \beta\eta) + C(1 + \varepsilon^{-1})\beta^2] \mathcal{T} - \beta\tau\bar{\psi} \\ & + [-(\Phi'\tau + 1) + c_1(\Phi'' - (1 + \varepsilon)(\Phi')^2)] \sum_i f_i\lambda_i^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

In order to choose Φ , let $a > 0$ be a positive number such that $\tau \geq 2a$ which is guaranteed by our assumption. Then we define

$$\Phi(\tau) = -\log(\tau - a).$$

It is easy to check that $\Phi'' - (1 + \varepsilon)(\Phi')^2 < 0$. Moreover, for $\varepsilon = \frac{a^2}{2c_1}$ we have

$$-(\Phi'\tau + 1) + c_1(\Phi'' - (1 + \varepsilon)(\Phi')^2) = \frac{a}{\tau - a} - \frac{c_1\varepsilon}{(\tau - a)^2} \geq \frac{a^2}{2(\tau - a)^2} \geq c_2 > 0.$$

Therefore we get from (24) that

$$0 \geq c_0 \lambda_1 - C - C\mathcal{T} + c_2 \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2.$$

Since $\lambda_n \leq -\theta \lambda_1$ and $f_n \geq \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{T}$, we have $\sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 \geq f_n \lambda_n^2 \geq \frac{1}{n} \theta^2 \mathcal{T} \lambda_1^2$. Hence

$$0 \geq c_0 \lambda_1 - C - C\mathcal{T} + \frac{c_2 \theta^2}{n} \mathcal{T} \lambda_1^2.$$

This clearly implies λ_1 is bounded from above.

Case 2. $\lambda_n \geq -\theta \lambda_1$.

We now have $\lambda_i \geq -\theta \lambda_1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let us partition $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into two parts: $I = \{j : f_j \leq 4f_1\}$ and $J = \{j : f_j > 4f_1\}$. Using (14) we have for $i \in I$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} f_i |\nabla_i b_{11}|^2 &= f_i |\Phi' \nabla_i \tau - \beta \nabla_i \eta|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) (\Phi')^2 f_i |\nabla_i \tau|^2 + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \beta^2 f_i |\nabla_i \eta|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) (\Phi')^2 f_i |\nabla_i \tau|^2 + C(1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \beta^2 f_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore it follows from (22) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq c_0 \lambda_1 - C(1 + |\Phi'|) - \beta \tau \bar{\psi} - (1 + \beta \eta) \mathcal{T} - (\Phi' \tau + 1) \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 \\ &\quad + [\Phi'' - (1 + \varepsilon) (\Phi')^2] \sum_i f_i |\nabla_i \tau|^2 - C(1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \beta^2 f_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{j \in J} f_j |\nabla_j b_{11}|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ij,kl} \nabla_1 b_{ij} \nabla_1 b_{kl}. \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding exactly as before we have

$$-(\Phi' \tau + 1) \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 + [\Phi'' - (1 + \varepsilon) (\Phi')^2] \sum_i f_i |\nabla_i \tau|^2 \geq c_2 \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2$$

if we choose $\varepsilon = \frac{a^2}{2c_1}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq c_0 \lambda_1 - C(1 + |\Phi'|) - \beta \tau \bar{\psi} - (1 + \beta \eta) \mathcal{T} + c_2 \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 - C(1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \beta^2 f_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{j \in J} f_j |\nabla_j b_{11}|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ij,kl} \nabla_1 b_{ij} \nabla_1 b_{kl}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

By using Lemma 2 and noting $1 \notin J$ we have

$$-\frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ij,kl} \nabla_1 b_{ij} \nabla_1 b_{kl} \geq -\frac{2}{\lambda_1} \sum_{j \in J} \frac{f_1 - f_j}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_j} |\nabla_1 b_{1j}|^2 = -\frac{2}{\lambda_1} \sum_{j \in J} \frac{f_1 - f_j}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_j} |\nabla_j b_{11}|^2.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq c_0 \lambda_1 - C(1 + |\Phi'|) - \beta \tau \bar{\psi} - (1 + \beta \eta) \mathcal{T} - C(1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \beta^2 f_1 + c_2 \sum_i f_i \lambda_i^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{\lambda_1} \sum_{j \in J} \frac{f_1 - f_j}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_j} |\nabla_j b_{11}|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{j \in J} f_j |\nabla_j b_{11}|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

We claim that

$$-\frac{2}{\lambda_1} \frac{f_1 - f_j}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_j} \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} f_j, \quad \forall j \in J.$$

This is equivalent to showing $2f_1\lambda_1 \leq f_j\lambda_1 + f_j\lambda_j$. Since $j \in J$, we have $f_j > 4f_1$. If $\lambda_j \geq 0$, this is obviously true. If $\lambda_j < 0$, then $-\theta\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_j < 0$, and hence

$$f_j\lambda_1 + f_j\lambda_j \geq (1 - \theta)f_j\lambda_1 \geq 4(1 - \theta)f_1\lambda_1 \geq 2f_1\lambda_1$$

if we choose $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$. From this claim and (26) we obtain

$$0 \geq c_0\lambda_1 - C - \beta\tau\bar{\psi} - (1 + \beta\eta)\mathcal{T} + c_2 \sum_i f_i\lambda_i^2 - C(1 + \varepsilon^{-1})\beta^2 f_1.$$

Recall the definition of η , we have $-c_3 \leq \eta \leq -c_4$ for two positive constants c_3 and c_4 . Choose β to be sufficiently large so that $-(1 + \beta\eta) \geq 0$. Then we get

$$0 \geq -C + c_0\lambda_1 + c_2f_1\lambda_1^2 - Cf_1.$$

This clearly implies an upper bound for λ_1 . ■

4. PROOF OF MAIN RESULT

Since the proof of Theorem 1 essentially follows the lines in [14], only the sketch will be given below.

We may assume that neither $z(u) \equiv R_1$ nor $z(u) \equiv R_2$ is a solution of (1); otherwise we are done. Let us fix some $\bar{R}$ such that $R_1 < \bar{R} < R_2$ and define a family of functions

$$\bar{\psi}^t(u, \rho) := t\bar{\psi}(u, \rho) + (1 - t)A^\varepsilon \coth^{1+\varepsilon}(\rho), \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a positive constant and $A = \coth^{-1}(\bar{R})$. Fix $0 < \alpha < 1$, and denote by $C_a^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ the subset of functions from $C^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ which is k -admissible. We define a family of operators $\Psi(\cdot, t) : C_a^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n) \rightarrow C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ by

$$\Psi(z(u), t) \equiv F(\mathbf{B}) - \bar{\psi}^t(u, z(u)), \quad u \in \mathbb{S}^n,$$

where $z \in C_a^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ and $\mathbf{B}$ is the second fundamental form of $\mathcal{M} := \{(u, z(u)) : u \in \mathbb{S}^n\}$. Consider the family of equations

$$\Psi(z, t) \equiv 0. \tag{27}$$

One can show that neither $z(u) \equiv R_1$ nor $z(u) \equiv R_2$ is a solution of (27) for any $t \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, by the strong maximum principle, any solution $z \in C_a^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ of (27) satisfying $R_1 \leq z(u) \leq R_2$ for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^n$ must satisfy the strict inequalities

$$R_1 < z(u) < R_2 \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{S}^n. \tag{28}$$

By using the C^1 -estimates in [5], Theorem 2, the result of Evans and Krylov, and Schauder theory for second order uniformly elliptic equations one can obtain

$$\|z\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)} < C \tag{29}$$

for any solution $z \in C_a^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ of (27) satisfying (28), where C is a constant depending only on k, n, R_1, R_2 and $\|\psi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})}$.

We can choose a constant $\delta > 0$ depending on k, n, R_1, R_2 and C such that

$$\delta \leq \overline{\psi}^t(u, z(u)) \leq \delta^{-1} \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{S}^n,$$

where $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $z \in C_a^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ satisfying (28) and (29). Consequently we can find an open set V of Γ_k satisfying $\overline{V} \subset \Gamma_k$ such that $\lambda(\mathbf{B}) \in V$ for any $z \in C_a^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ satisfying (28), (29) and $\delta \leq F(\mathbf{B}) \leq \delta^{-1}$. Now we define an open bounded subset O^* of $C^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ by

$$O^* := \{z \in C^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n) : z \text{ satisfies (28), (29) and } \lambda(\mathbf{B}) \in V\}$$

One can show that

$$\Psi(\cdot, t)^{-1}(0) \cap \partial O^* = \emptyset \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq 1$$

when $\Psi(\cdot, t)$ are viewed as maps from $\overline{O^*} \subset C^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ to $C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$. Therefore, the degree $\deg(\Psi(\cdot, t), O^*, 0)$ is defined for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and is independent of t ; see [12].

Comparing a solution with spheres $z \equiv \text{constant}$ and using the maximum principle as usual, we know that $z_0(u) \equiv \overline{R}$ is the unique solution in O^* of the equation $\Psi(z, 0) = 0$. Clearly, the linearized operator $\Psi_z(z_0, 0)$ is of the form

$$\Psi_z(z_0, 0) = -a^{ij}(u)\nabla_{ij} + b^i(u)\nabla_i + c(u),$$

where $(a^{ij}(u))$ is positive definite. Since

$$\Psi(sz_0, 0) = \coth(sz_0) - A^\epsilon \coth^{1+\epsilon}(sz_0),$$

we have, in view of $A \coth(\overline{R}) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{R}c(u) &= \Psi_z(z_0, 0)(z_0) = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=1} \Psi(sz_0, 0) = \frac{d}{d\rho} \Big|_{\rho=\overline{R}} [\coth(\rho) - A^\epsilon \coth^{1+\epsilon}(\rho)] \\ &= -\epsilon \frac{d}{d\rho} \Big|_{\rho=\overline{R}} \coth(\rho) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\Psi_z(z_0, 0)$ is an invertible operator from $C^{4,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ to $C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n)$. It follows, as in [14], that

$$\deg(\Psi(\cdot, 1), O^*, 0) = \deg(\Psi(\cdot, 0), O^*, 0) \neq 0.$$

Therefore, the equation

$$\Psi(z, 1) = 0, \quad z \in O^*$$

has at least one solution. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Andrews, Contraction of convex hypersurfaces in Euclidean space, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 2(1994), 151–171.
- [2] B. Andrews, Pinching estimates and motion of hypersurfaces by curvature functions, 2004, <http://arXiv:math.DG/0402311>.
- [3] I. Bakelman and B. Kantor, Estimates for solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations connected with problems of geometry in the large, *Mat. Sbornik* 91 (133) (1973), 336–349, Engl. Transl., *Math. USSR-Sbornik* 20 (1973), 348–363.

- [4] I. Bakelman and B. Kantor, Existence of spherically homeomorphic hypersurfaces in Euclidean space with prescribed mean curvature, *Geometry and Topology, Leningrad*, 1 (1974), 3-10.
- [5] J. L. M. Barbosa, J. H. S. Lira, V. I. Oliker, A priori estimates for starshaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed m th curvature function in space forms, *Nonlinear Problems of Mathematical Physics and Related Topics I*, 2002, 35–52.
- [6] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second order elliptic equations III. Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian, *Acta Math.*, 155(1985), 261–301.
- [7] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, Nonlinear second order elliptic equations IV. Starshaped compact Weingarten hypersurfaces. In *Current Topics in PDE'S*, ed. by Y. Ohya, K. Kasahara, N. Shimakura, Kinokunia Co. LTD, Tokyo, 1-26, 1986.
- [8] E. Calabi, Improper affine hypersurfaces of convex type and a generalization of a theorem by K. Jörgens, *Mich. Math. J.* 5 (1958), 105-126.
- [9] C. Davis, All convex invariant functions of Hermitian matrices, *Arch. Math.* 8 (1957), 276-278.
- [10] K. Ecker and G. Huisken, Immersed hypersurfaces with constant Weingarten curvature, *Math. Ann.* 283 (1989), 329-332.
- [11] C. Gerhardt, Closed Weingarten hypersurfaces in Riemannian manifolds, *J. Diff. Geometry*, 43(1996), 612–641.
- [12] Y. Y. Li, Degree theory for second order nonlinear elliptic operators and its applications, *Comm. in PDEs*, 14(1989), 1541–1579.
- [13] Y. Y. Li, Some existence results of fully nonlinear elliptic equations of Monge-Ampère type, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 43 (1990), 233-271.
- [14] Y. Y. Li and V. I. Oliker, Starshaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed m -th mean curvature in elliptic space. *J. Partial Differential Equations*, 15(2002), no. 3, 68–80.
- [15] V. I. Oliker, Hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{\kappa+\mathbb{H}^{\ell}}$ with prescribed Gaussian curvature and related equations of Monge-Ampère type, *Comm. Partial Diff. Equations* 9 (1984), 807-838.
- [16] V. I. Oliker, The Gauss curvature and Minkowski problems in space forms, *Comtemp. Math.* 101(1989), 107–123.
- [17] A. V. Pogorelov, On the improper affine hypersurfaces, *Geom. Dedicata* 1 (1972), 33-46.
- [18] W. M. Sheng, J. Urbas, X. J. Wang, Interior curvature bounds for a class of curvature equations, *Duke Math. J.*, 123(2004), 235–264.
- [19] A.E. Treibergs and S.W. Wei, Embedded hyperspheres with prescribed mean curvature, *J. Diff. Geom.* 18 (1983), 513-521.
- [20] J. Urbas, Hessian equations on compact Riemannian manifolds, *Nonlinear problems in mathematical physics and related topics*, II, 367–377, 2002.
- [21] J. Urbas, The Dirichlet problem for the equation of prescribed scalar curvature in Minkowski space, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 18 (2003), 307–316.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY 08903

E-mail address: yyli@math.rutgers.edu, qjin@math.rutgers.edu